

Serial No. 10/619,951

Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

No amendments have been made to the claims. The claims have been reproduced for the Examiner's convenience.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103***Bäck***

Claims 1-4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,772,778 to Bäck ("Bäck").

Claim 1 relates to a drive-transferring apparatus that includes a plurality of drive-transferring members that are capable of transferring drive between discrete parts of a constraining guide by means of *compressive interconnection*. Using compressive interconnection between the drive-transferring members reduces the chances of tensile failure of components. Other advantages of using compressive interconnection between the drive-transferring members are set out in the application as filed, and the Examiner's attention is directed to page 2, line 25 to page 4, line 1.

The Bäck patent discloses a device for cleaning and dispensing golf balls from a magazine. No teaching or suggestion has been found in Bäck that the motive force or drive is transferred through the apparatus by means of compressive interconnection between the golf balls. As can be seen clearly from the figures, the golf balls generally are fed by gravity. The golf balls are further driven through the apparatus by a drive brush roll 42, eccentric roll 62 and out feed roll 82. It is clear that there is no drive transferred through the system through any compressive interconnection between the golf balls.

Weiselfish

Claims 1, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,700,633 to Weiselfish et al. ("Weiselfish").

Weiselfish relates to a conveyor transport system that uses conventional technology to transfer garments around the system. The system disclosed in Weiselfish includes a propulsion track 10 having wide pushers 15 extending

Serial No. 10/619,951

downwardly from it. Trolleys riding on the rail are propelled by the pushers in a clockwise direction (see Weiselfish, col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 6, for example).

As Weiselfish explained in more detail with reference to FIG. 2, and the corresponding text at column 4, lines 17-34, the pushers are driven by an endlessly moving chain located within the overhead propulsion track 10. This clearly shows that the system disclosed in Weiselfish uses a chain to transfer motive force. Clearly the system disclosed in Weiselfish is therefore a system using a tensile drive and no compressive interconnection between any drive transferring members has been found in Weiselfish.

For at least the above reasons, the claims are believed to be novel and non-obvious in view of the applied references, Bäck and Weiselfish. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By Christopher B. Jacobs
Christopher B. Jacobs, Reg. No. 37,853

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

Z:\SEC152\152\DWB\EPCLIP\0104\0104USA.R01.wpd